DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 673 FL 024 721

AUTHOR Swierzbin, Bonnie
TITLE Word Order with Separable Phrasal Verbs.
PUB DATE 1996-03-12
NOTE 60p.; Study in partial fulfillment of Master of Arts, University of Minnesota.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses (040) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *English; *English (Second Language); *Grammar; Instructional Materials; Language Patterns; Language Research; Media Selection; Reference Materials; Second Language Instruction; Semantics; Sentence Structure; *Syntax; *Verbs
IDENTIFIERS Direct Objects; *Phrasal Verbs; *Word Order

ABSTRACT

Phrasal verbs occur frequently in written and spoken English and may be difficult for non-native speakers to understand and produce, particularly when parts of the phrasal verb should be separated and when they should be adjacent. The study reported here analyzes natural data in context to determine whether the word order of the parts of a separable transitive phrasal verb and a direct object are predicted by (1) the length of the object phrase, (2) whether the object is stressed, (3) whether the object represents an idea that has already been referred to, (4) the predictability of the idea represented by the object, given the linguistic and situational contexts, and (5) whether the object is semantically empty. Reference grammars, English-as-a-Second-Language pedagogical grammars, and specialized grammars for two-word verbs are also reviewed for information about how word order with phrasal verbs is being taught. Contains 29 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 673

Word Order with Separable Phrasal Verbs

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts degree in the
Program in Teaching English as a Second Language
at the University of Minnesota

by

Bonnie Swierzbin
March 12, 1996

Abstract -- Phrasal verbs turn up almost everywhere in written and spoken English and are often difficult for non-native English speakers to understand. It can also be difficult for them to understand when the parts of a phrasal verb should be separated and when they should be adjacent. This study analyzes natural data in context to determine whether the word order of the parts of a separable transitive phrasal verb and a direct object are predicted by 1) the length of the object, 2) whether the object is stressed, 3) whether the object represents an idea that has already been referred to, 4) the predictability of the idea represented by the object given the linguistic and situational contexts, and 5) whether the object is semantically empty. Reference grammars, ESL pedagogical grammars and specialized grammars for two-word verbs are reviewed for information about how word order with phrasal verbs is being taught.

FL024721

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bonnie
Swierzbin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Phrasal verbs turn up almost everywhere in written and spoken English. Although their usage is mostly associated with informal, slangy speech (*Hurry up! Chill out!*), they also appear in newspaper articles, on signs and in scientific journals.

(1) In 1990 lawmakers adopted a unique refund program under which individual contributors can *get* up to $50 *back* from the state treasury once a year. (St. Paul Pioneer Press, August 6, 1995)

Thank you! Please *buckle up*! (University of Minnesota parking lot sign)

Starting in the 1960s, a number of distinguished Bantuists *sorted out* the major complexities of the Luganda tone system and provided analyses of them. (Hyman and Katamba, A new approach to tone in Luganda, *Language 69*(1))

Between three and four thousand phrasal verbs exist in modern English (Hook, 1981). The number appears to be increasing as speakers creatively coin new phrasal verbs from common words:

(2) Hey, it's opening weekend, dudes. It's time to *bait up*. Offer a leech for lunch. (Ron Schara, Star Tribune: Newspaper of the Twin Cities, May 7, 1995)

Although the parts of a phrasal verb are often common words, the combination of the parts may be difficult for non-native English speakers (NNSs) to understand since it often has an unexpected figurative meaning that cannot be derived from the parts. Consider the verb "turn up" in the first sentence of this paper. Understanding the words "turn" and "up" probably does not help an NNS grasp that "turn up" here means "appear." A more literal use of the phrasal verb "turn up", as in "Please turn up the radio," is most likely easier for NNSs to understand and produce than the figurative use, but this example illustrates other problems: What is the difference between "Please turn up the radio" and "Please turn the radio up"? When should the parts of a separable transitive phrasal verb be separated and when should they be adjacent?

The optional separation of verb and particle in sentences with direct objects headed by nouns (not pronouns) is what distinguishes phrasal verbs (3) from verb-preposition combinations (4), and from verb-adverb combinations (5).

(3) He *ran up* a huge bill.
He *ran* a huge bill *up*.

She *looked over* your report. (examined)
She *looked* your report *over*.

(4) He ran up a huge hill.
*He ran a huge hill up.

She looked over your fence. (peered over the top)
*She looked your fence over.

(5) *He ran quickly the marathon.
He ran the marathon quickly.

*She pushed outward the window.
She pushed the window outward.

Bolinger (1971) uses a refined version of the separation criterion, called the Definite-Noun-Phrase Test (p. 61), to define transitive phrasal verbs. The framework for the test is a simple definite noun phrase which is either a single proper noun (e.g. 'Bob') or an unmodified common noun preceded by *the* (e.g. 'the grapefruit'). A transitive phrasal verb, then, is defined as a verb plus adverb combination for which the adverb is allowed to precede a simple definite direct object noun phrase (p. 64). This paper will refer to an adverb used this way as a particle whether or not the direct object is a noun and whether or not the particle precedes the object. This definition will include *run up* (increase rapidly) and *look over* (examine) given in (3) as phrasal verbs while excluding the verb-preposition combinations *run up* and *look over* given in (4). It also excludes verb-adverb combinations such as *push outward* and *run quickly* given in (5) because the adverbs are not allowed to precede the simple definite direct object (DO) noun phrases (NP) in these sentences. The framework of a simple definite NP is essential to the definition because, although it is unusual,

an NP with added modifiers can be acceptable as a DO following many adverbs in addition to the adverbs that are normally thought of as creating phrasal verbs.

(6) The next thing I knew, the board was replaced--but I did notice Squirrelly *watching closely* the whole operation from the crotch of a nearby tree, and it did occur to me that it might be a female looking for a place to have babies. (St. Paul Pioneer Press Bulletin Board, May 3, 1995)

Other grammarians (e.g. Fraser, 1976) further limit the definition of a phrasal verb to combinations which are figurative or idiomatic (7), excluding the literal combinations (8).

(7) He *threw up* his dinner. (vomited)
Jones *pulled off* the deal. (succeeded)

(8) He *threw up* the ball. (tossed upward)
Jones *pulled off* the tablecloth. (yanked) (Fraser's examples and paraphrases, p. 3)

This definition has problems, however, because the distinctions between the categories literal, figurative and idiomatic are not always clear and the same combination may fall into more than one category depending on the contexts in which it is used. For example, '*The sergeant shot down a Stuka over Dresden*' would be literal, but '*The sergeant shot down my idea in the meeting*' would be figurative. The question of when to separate the parts of a transitive phrasal verb applies to verbs whether they are literal, figurative, or idiomatic, so the current study uses Bolinger's broader definition of a transitive phrasal verb and includes verbs of all semantic categories.

The English language is rich in phrasal verbs, their usage is common, and they often are a source of difficulty for NNSs; however, research on phrasal verbs, particularly regarding when the verb and particle should be separated and when they should be adjacent, has been rather limited.

Fraser (1976, p. 20) makes the seven observations listed below about the positioning of the particle relative to the direct object, while noting that

acceptability of positioning varies from speaker to speaker. (All the examples in the following list are his.)

1. If the direct object is a pronoun which is not contrastively stressed relative to another pronoun, the particle follows the direct object.

*She *stirred up* it.
She *stirred* it *up*.

2. If the direct object is a pronoun which is contrastively stressed relative to another pronoun, the particle may precede the direct object.

I didn't say to *call up* HER.
Figure out THESE, not THOSE.

3. If the phrasal verb takes an indirect object (IO) in addition to a direct object, when the DO precedes the IO, the particle usually appears before the DO unless it is a pronoun.

The man *gave out* the money to the poor.
*The man *gave* the money *out* to the poor.
The man *gave* it *out* to the poor.

4. If the phrasal verb takes an indirect object in addition to the direct object, the IO does not normally precede the DO when neither is a pronoun.

The man gave the poor the money.
*The man *gave out* the poor the money.

5. When the direct object is a noun which is a single word, the sentence is more acceptable with the particle next to the verb; thus Fraser considers the first sentence of the following pair better than the second.

You should *call up* John before you go.
You should *call* John *up* before you go.

6. When the verb is used to express habitual action in the present, the sentence is more acceptable with the particle next to the verb.

The cook *washes up* the plates.
The cook *washes* the plates *up*.

7. The particle must precede the direct object when the DO is long and complicated.

*I *called* the man who left *up*.
*The ogre *ran* the sweet innocent little children *down*.
*The crooks *bumped* the man returning from the movie *off*.

Fraser notes, however, that length alone does not determine particle position since the next examples are acceptable.

He *called* all my best friends *up*.
Won't you *total* some of those larger figures *up*?
Some *charged* the adding machine fire-loss *off* to experience.

He does not mention the source of the data on which he based his observations, nor is any context given for the example sentences.

According to Fraser, some of the word orders which he observed are determined by the phonetic form of the verb phrase, based on the following facts:

> First, the intonation center of the English verb phrase is normally on the final constituent.
>
> Second, the particle usually receives a heavier stress than does the verb with which it is associated and a heavier stress than the direct object when the particle follows it.
>
> Third, pronouns do not receive stress unless contrastively stressed (p. 20).

This explains why a contrastively stressed pronoun appears after the direct object and a noncontrastive (unstressed) pronoun before it; however, Fraser offers only speculation about explanations for the observations above involving DOs which are not pronouns (3 - 7). He surmises that the sentences in (9) are unacceptable and not preferred, respectively, because two relatively heavy stresses would occur near the end of the verb phrase: on *money* and *out*, and on *John* and *up*.

(9) *The man *gave* the money *out* to the poor.
You should *call* John *up* before you go.

According to Fraser, "The phonotactics of English weigh against this phonetic pattern" (p. 21). This seems to be a rather weak argument since many people

find the first sentence acceptable, and in fact accept the particle after the second object in a double object construction, e.g.

(10) John *paid* the bank his loan *back*.

In the second example in (9), Fraser claims both *John* and *up* receive relatively heavy stress and he claims that '*You should call up John before you go*' is the preferred word order. However, changing the sentence to the preferred word order will not change the fact that two relatively heavy stresses occur at the end of the verb phrase; some additional explanation is needed.

Fraser speculates further that verbs used to express habitual action are stressed more than accompanying particles and that putting the particle after the DO in a sentence such as '*The cook washes the plates up.*' would not be preferred since stress would fall on both the particle (because it is in sentence-final position) and the verb (because it is habitual). For his final observation that the particle must precede long, complicated direct objects, he theorizes that an intonation drop in the DO actually is the deciding factor: if there is a drop, the particle precedes the DO; if there is none, the particle may follow the DO. For example, he says that the internal structure of the DO in *"*I called the man who left up*' requires an intonation drop after *the man*, but that there is no intonation drop in the DO in '*Some charged the adding machine fire-loss off to experience.*' There is clearly a structural difference between these two examples since the former contains a relative clause and the latter is a compound noun. However, this does not explain the unacceptability of *"*The ogre ran the sweet innocent little children down*'; this last example has several adjectives preceding a noun, which seems structurally more similar to a compound noun than to an NP followed by a relative clause. Fraser does not say where an intonation drop should occur or what structure he thinks causes one. Again, some additional explanation is needed.

Erades (1961) claims that both stress and word order are effects of another factor: newsworthiness. He states that the principle governing the position of the direct object relative to the particle is

> neither stress nor length nor rhythm, but something quite different: the news value which the idea denoted by the object has in the sentence. Objects denoting ideas that have news value, no matter whether they are nouns or pronouns, long or short, have end-position; those that have no such value come between verb and adverb (p. 57).

Rather than defining newsworthiness directly, Erades says that the idea denoted by the direct object is *not* newsworthy when the idea is already familiar to the reader or hearer, and he describes two situations in which this is the case. The first situation occurs when the idea was mentioned "shortly before" (p. 58). His examples for this case are given in (11).

(11) A series of thuds out in the hall announced the descent of Megan and her *suitcase*.
Joanna, behind me, said urgently, "Come on, I've already refused some nice hot tea twice."
We went out to the car. It annoyed me that Joanna had to *sling the suitcase in*. (Agatha Christie, *The Moving Finger*, ch. 2, p. 48)

We'll *make up a parcel* for them..... On the morning of Christmas Eve together we *made the parcel up*. (Punch, 25/12, 1915)

In the second situation (see (12) below), the DO is one of a group of what Erades calls "semi-pronomial nouns", which "always vaguely and loosely refer to an idea under discussion or a matter in hand" (p. 58).

(12) He seemed to be thinking *the matter* over. (Sweet. *Primer of Spoken English*, p. 52)

We'll talk *things* over presently. (unattributed)

He laughed *the idea* down. (unattributed)

The description of what is not newsworthy is vague because "shortly before" is undefined, and "semi-pronomial noun" is not clearly defined. A better definition for the latter term can be found in Kruisinga and Erades (1967) where the authors say that semi-pronomial words do not clearly belong to only one of the

categories noun or pronoun because they are used in ways such that they could be categorized with both classes (p. 581). Semi-pronomial words behave like nouns in some sentences (see (13a)) because they

1) occur freely with determiners

2) inflect with *-s* for number

3) inflect with *-'s* for the genitive

4) are normally premodified by adjectives

(13a) *Three people* are feared to have been drowned. (Kruisinga and Erades, p. 587, unattributed)

It was *a man* who had come to get the boat over to the Island. (L. A. G. Strong, *The Burial Race*)

In a small place like this there is a good deal of curiosity about *other people's* affairs. (Sweet, *Primer of Spoken English*, p. 74)

Many worse things can befall a gentleman than to be reduced to smoking Folly's Havana Resurrections. (R. Graves, *Antigua, Penny, Puce*, Ch. II)

They behave like pronouns in other sentences (see (13b)) because they

1) can only occur without determiners or with limited determiners

2) are often postmodified by adjectives

(13b) *People* didn't use to eat so much meat as they do now. (Sweet, *Elementarbuch*, No. 15)

There is everything *a man* can possibly want in these dales, from trout streams to wild moorland walks. (J. B. Priestly, *English Journey*, Ch. VI)

His love of *things theatrical*. (Ward, *Dickens*, Ch. 1)

What was to be done? *Matters*, instead of improving, had grown worse. (Lawrence, *The Woman Who Rode Away*, p. 10)

Funny how one can see *a person* every day and not know the colour of their hair. (*One-Act Plays*, selected by J. W. Marriot. First Series. Harrap. 1924, p. 104)

But you will allow that in *matters musical* my opinion is worth something. (Hichens, *Ambition*, Ch. 1)

Erades points out that there are correlations between the news value of an idea denoted by an object and the stress and length of the object. The less newsworthy the idea is, the more likely it is to be presented by an unstressed pronoun or semi-pronomial noun, e.g. *things*. Erades supports his position mostly with data gathered from written British English:

(14) He seemed to be *thinking* the matter *over*. (Sweet. *Primer of Spoken English*, p. 52, 1895)
We'll *make up* a parcel for them.. On the morning of Christmas Eve together we *made* the parcel *up*. (Punch, 25/12, 1915)
Our unknown murderer has got to *think up* something else. (Agatha Christie, *A Murder is Announced*, p. 134, 1950)

The first sentence in (14) illustrates a semi-pronomial noun appearing before the particle; the second illustrates a noun following the particle, then being moved before the particle as its newsworthiness decreases; the third shows an indefinite pronoun following the particle because it provides new information (the murderer's previous scheme having allegedly failed) (p. 58-9).

Bolinger (1971) essentially supports Erades' claim that newsworthiness of the DO is the major factor governing the position of the object relative to the parts of a phrasal verb, but he seems to have redefined newsworthiness as simply new information or lack of redundancy, that is, repetition, and does not consider it to be the only governing factor; he studies the interplay of position, stress, and length with news value. In particular, he looks at the effect changes in position and stress seem to have on the news value of parts of a sentence. With the following example (15), he points out that placing the DO between the verb and particle is not the only way to indicate that the object has been mentioned before. In speech, in fact, one could leave the object at the end of the sentence but not stress it, which is what would have to be done to indicate redundancy when a phrasal verb is not used (p. 53).

(15) Had she not so brought her child UP?
Had she not so brought UP her child?
Had she not so REARED her child?

He states that putting a word in the end position and not stressing it is the clearest way to indicate redundancy and regards the mid position as neutral in this regard.

> By putting the particle at the end and accenting it, we recapture the power to make the verb the high point without explicitly degrading anything else. By putting it there and not accenting it, we are able to make the verb explicitly redundant. In addition, nothing is sacrificed. The following set brings together the major contrasts:
>
> How can they put NIXON over?
> How can they put over NIXON?
> How can they put Nixon OVER?
> How can they put OVER Nixon?
> How can they PUT Nixon over?
>
> The first occurs in a setting where acts of political maneuvering are familiar (*putting over* may or may not actually have been mentioned). The second and third approach the political maneuver from outside: they could be spoken by someone broaching the whole question of politics, the difference being in the relative newsworthiness of the person or the action. The fourth treats Nixon as redundant. The last is an instance of rectification--the accent displaced onto a syllable that would be meaningless if interpreted as highlighted in its own right implies "How can such things be?" "How can they be thinking of such a thing?" (p. 54-5).

Bolinger then introduces the term 'familiarity': what is usual under the circumstances (e.g. a child being told to put her nightie on at bedtime) or when an action is based on an object that entails the action (e.g. a boat entails sailing).

> (16) It's almost ten o'clock. Put your NIGHTIE on, now, and run up to bed.
> Where's Joe? He's sailing his BOAT in. He'll be along in a minute.

Familiarity seems to be closer than redundancy to Erades' original idea of what is not newsworthy:

> It is not necessary for the actual noun to have been mentioned before; it is enough that the idea represented by the noun should have been referred to, in whatever terms, or that the situation should suggest it, or that it should be readily inferable from the circumstances of the case, in short, that the idea and hence the noun denoting it, should have no news value for the hearer (Erades, p. 58).

Analyzing the effect an item's familiarity or lack of newsworthiness (using Erades' definition) has on its position in a sentence implies a certain amount of knowledge about the context in which the sentence was spoken or written. Unfortunately, the previously mentioned research suffers from some limitations

in this area: Erades does provide some context for his data, but he has very little data. His examples are probably outdated since they were drawn mostly from early twentieth- century sources; it is estimated that the usage of phrasal verbs increased approximately fifty percent from pre-World War I to post-World War II (Spasov, quoted in Bolinger (1971) p. xi). Fraser and Bolinger are generally content to use introspective data and provide little or no context for their examples. Bolinger seems to be mainly concerned with studying distinctions resulting from varying word order and stress patterns based on context-free, constructed examples. Although he brings up the importance of contextual effects when he discusses familiarity, he says he "can only assume" familiarity of some objects in his examples (p. 57).

The main purpose of the current study is to analyze natural data in context to determine whether the word order of the parts of a separable transitive phrasal verb and a direct object are predicted by 1) the length of the object, 2) whether the object is stressed, 3) whether the object represents an idea that has already been referred to, 4) the familiarity of the idea represented by the object, and 5) whether the object is semi-pronomial. Length was selected as a potential predictor because Fraser and many pedagogical grammars (which will be discussed later) claim that it determines word order. The other potential predictors are parts of the definitions of familiarity and lack of newsworthiness or related to them. The second part of the study reviews reference grammars, pedagogical grammars for English as a Second Language (ESL), and specialized grammars for two-word verbs to determine how phrasal verbs and word order are presented to learners.

Method

Nine individuals, six women and three men, ranging in age from approximately thirty-five to seventy-five, participated in this study. All of the participants are members of my extended family and are native speakers of English; two of them are residents of Minnesota, one is a resident of Texas and the remainder are residents of Michigan. I was a participant in this study as well as an observer. The participants were recorded on audio tape several times over the course of a week as they took part in typical family conversations. Although the participants knew they would be recorded as part of the study, they were often not aware of the particular times when they were recorded since the tape recorder was usually placed inconspicuously on the floor or under a table. The participants were told that word order was being studied but they were not aware of the details of the study.

Each phrase in the conversation which contained a separable phrasal verb was transcribed along with enough of the preceding conversation so that the topic is clear. If the direct object of a phrasal verb refers to something in the immediately preceding conversation, the referent is included in the transcription. In some cases, the direct object refers to something much earlier in the conversation or to a person or an object that is clear only through the pragmatics of the situation. These instances are noted in the transcript. A complete copy of the transcript is in Appendix A.

Definition of Variables

The transcribed phrasal verbs were divided into three types:

1. verb NP- particle
2. verb particle NP-
3. verb personal pronoun particle

There were no instances of verb + particle + personal pronoun in the data. NP^- means any noun phrase other than a personal pronoun. This means that NP^- includes demonstrative pronouns ('*find that out*') and compound indefinite pronouns ('*find out anything*'). Personal pronouns were separated from other types of pronouns for two reasons. First, Bolinger (1971) and many reference and pedagogical grammars (which are reviewed in detail in a later section) frequently state only that personal pronouns must separate verbs and particles, i.e., they do not discuss other types of pronouns. Second, compound indefinite pronouns are similar to semi-pronomial nouns in that they inflect with *-'s* for the genitive (*somebody's* parka) and are postmodified by adjectives (*Anyone intelligent* would move to Florida.). This study focuses on NP^- direct objects.

Length

For the phrasal verbs with an NP^- direct object, the length of each NP^- was measured in words.

Stress

For each phrasal verb the point of the heaviest relative stress was noted: the verb, the particle, or the direct object. Stress is indicated in the transcript items by bold type.

Familiar

The idea represented by an NP^- direct object was considered to be familiar if it was predictable in the linguistic context, in the situational context, or from a combination of the two, and not familiar otherwise. An example of an idea that is predictable in the linguistic context is item 30. The phrasal verb '*peel off* ' together with '*hot dog*' from the previous utterance entail the idea represented by the DO '*the skin*'.

B: I don't remember getting a hot dog.
Item 30: C: Oh, I do, cuz I remember I used to *peel the **skin** off.*

Item 51 is an example of a situation in which the DO is predictable from the situational context. Because the topic of the conversation is referred to with a semi-pronomial noun (*thing*) and a pronoun (*it*) and the verb (*put*) immediately preceding the DO is semantically bleached as well, the linguistic context provides very little information to the hearer.

R: Can I take this thing off now?
Ba: If you want to.
R: No, I'd rather sit here with it on.
Item 51: Ba: Do you want to *put **Jennifer** in* so you can see what it feels like?

In this situation, the two speakers are discussing a baby backpack which was borrowed to use on a family outing the following day. The first speaker has tried the backpack on and is wearing it as he speaks. There are two babies in the room, both of whom are potential candidates to be carried in the backpack since they will both be taken on the outing; however, the speakers know from prior discussions that the backpack is intended for only one of them. Thus the possibilities for whom or what will be put in the backpack are limited to one by the situational context.

Item 5 in the transcript provides an example of a referent that is predictable from a combination of the linguistic and situational contexts.

C: The breeze feels good.
Ri: Yeah, that breeze coming in this family room is great.
G: Well, what I think we'll do is turn off the air conditioner in
Item 5: that bedroom so it ain't too cold for you and *open up the **window**.*

The situational context is that the speakers are sitting in a room adjacent to the family room. The only air conditioner is in the bedroom of the person to whom the last comment was addressed; the bedroom has only one window which can

be opened and it faces the direction from which the breeze is blowing. There is nothing else in the bedroom that can be opened to provide a breeze. The relevant linguistic context is the word '*breeze*' and the transitive verb '*open up*'. Someone who hears the conversation would be very likely to predict that the DO of '*open up*' is '*door*' or '*window*' with some appropriate determiners or modifiers; the situational context limits the possibilities to a specific window.

Low Semantic Value

Each NP^- direct object was categorized by whether it has low semantic value or not. NP^-s that have low semantic value are semi-pronomial nouns and pronouns other than personal pronouns.

Idea Referred To

Each NP^- direct object was also categorized by whether the idea it represented had been referred to within the preceding minute of the conversation or not. One minute was an arbitrary time limit.

Although it seems as if a DO which represents an idea already referred to would also be familiar, this is not necessarily so. In some cases an earlier reference does make a DO predictable and therefore familiar, but in other cases, the situation is complicated enough that the DO is not predictable. In Item 77 we can see a direct object that refers to an idea that has already been mentioned, but is not familiar.

Item 77:
Re: I knew, I picked her up there just before I left the other day and I said, "I wouldn't want to carry her very far."
B: Yeah, I pick her up and then you pick Emily up and it's like...
M: You *pick* ***Emily*** *up* and you go, "Woooo."
<laughter>
B: There's not enough of this baby. She's too small.

The main topic of this conversation is a six-month old baby; the participants are discussing her size and how much she should be eating. In the

second turn of the conversation, the speaker compares this baby to her younger cousin, Emily, so for the following turn, the DO refers to an idea that was already mentioned. However, the idea is not familiar because, although it is very likely that the speaker will refer to one of the two babies, the listeners do not have any way to predict from the situation or the linguistic context which one it will be.

Item 34 contains a DO that both refers to an idea that has already been mentioned and is familiar.

Item 34:
G: Rita, aren't you gonna have a cup of coffee?
Ri: Oh, I don't know. Anybody like some cookies? Should I *bring the cookies **out***?
G: Marge's famous cookies.
Ri: Would you like me to warm up that coffee?
G: Don't eat them, you guys. If you eat 'em, there'll be less for me.
T: No.
Ri: No, that would be pretty awful, wouldn't it ?
T: No, it's just that I don't need it.

The cookies, the direct object of *bring out*, is familiar from the linguistic context, i.e. it has been referred to, and from the situation. The conversation is taking place near the end of a meal; cookies are a very common dessert in the family, so common, in fact, that none of the listeners bother to answer the question while the speaker goes on to ask about coffee and then brings the cookies from the kitchen into the dining room.

Five variables have been defined: *length*, *stress*, *familiar*, *low semantic value*, and *idea referred to*. In order to verify their independence, a correlation analysis was run. The results in Table 1 demonstrate that the variables are independent.

Table 1
Correlation Analysis

	Length	*Stress*	*Familiar*	*Low Semantic Value*	*Idea Referred To*
Length	1.00000	-0.18693	-0.22454	-0.22624	-0.18105
Stress		1.00000	0.03932	0.51862	0.28158
Familiar			1.00000	-0.32150	0.21627
Low Semantic Value				1.00000	0.12379
Idea Referred To					1.00000

DO Comes Between Verb and Particle

The dependent variable in this study is whether the direct object comes between the verb and particle. Its possible values are TRUE if the DO does come between and FALSE if it does not. Because this is a dichotomous variable, it was decided to analyze the differences in the number of DOs that come between verb and particle, given the values of the independent variables *length*, *stress*, *familiar*, *low semantic value*, and *idea referred to*, by means of logistic regression.[1] The null hypothesis for each independent variable is: When the other independent variables are included in the model, this independent variable is not significant. The significance level was set at $p < .05$.

Appendix B contains a table with the value of each variable for each transcript item with an NP^- direct object.

[1] Logistic regression analyses can be carried out in SAS with the LOGISTIC procedure. Logistic regression models the logarithm of the ratio of the probability that the dependent variable is true over the probability that the dependent variable is false as a linear combination of the independent variables. Logistic regression allows for a distinction between dependent and independent variables and for a mixture of categorical and continuous independent variables (Rietveld and van Hout, 1993, p. 258). The results of the logistic regression analyses in this study should be interpreted with some reservations because the individual data items do not completely meet the assumption of independence. The fifty phrasal verbs that were analyzed were produced by nine and not by fifty subjects.

Results

There were eighty separable phrasal verbs in the data. Of these, fifty verbs were used with NP- direct objects, thirty-one of which separated the verb and particle and nineteen of which did not. The remaining thirty verbs had personal pronouns as direct objects, all of which were unstressed and occurred between the verb and particle. Only the NP- direct objects were used to calculate the results in the remainder of this section.

Tables 2 through 6 show the observed frequencies of the dependent variable with each independent variable considered separately.

Table 2
Observed Frequencies of
Familiar and *DO Comes Between Verb and Particle*

DO comes between Verb and Particle		*Familiar* Yes	*Familiar* No	
	Yes	21	10	31
	No	6	13	19
		27	23	50

Table 3
Observed Frequencies of
Stress and *DO Comes Between Verb and Particle*

DO comes between Verb and Particle		*Stress** DO	*Stress** Particle	
	Yes	18	13	31
	No	18	1	19
		36	14	50

*There were no cases of stressed verbs.

Table 4
Observed Frequencies of
Low Semantic Value and *DO Comes Between Verb and Particle*

DO comes between Verb and Particle		*Low Semantic Value* Yes	*Low Semantic Value* No	
	Yes	6	25	31
	No	1	18	19
		7	43	50

Table 5
Observed Frequencies of
Idea Referred To and *DO Comes Between Verb and Particle*

DO comes between Verb and Particle		*Idea Referred To* Yes	*Idea Referred To* No	
	Yes	14	17	31
	No	7	12	19
		21	29	50

Table 6
Observed Frequencies of *Length* and
DO Comes Between Verb and Particle

DO comes between Verb and Particle		*Length* 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	Yes	11	13	4	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31
	No	4	10	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	19
		15	23	6	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	50

One feature of the data in Table 2 is that direct objects which represented familiar ideas were more likely to come between the verb and particle than to follow the particle. Another way to say this is if a direct object came between a verb and a particle, the object was 4.55 times more likely to be familiar than not familiar.[2] In Table 3 we see that for the data a stressed particle was very likely to follow the DO, while a stressed DO did not give us any information about what its position is likely to be. Examination of Table 4 shows that although there were only a few DOs with low semantic value in the data, they were very likely to appear between the verb and particle. Table 5 shows that DOs which represent ideas that were referred to previously were somewhat more likely to come between verb and particle than DOs which represent ideas that were not referred to. Another way to say this is if a direct object came between a verb and a particle, the object was about 2.5 times more likely to have been referred to than not referred to.

There are several interesting features of the data in Table 6. The first is that only four DOs out of fifty (8%) were five words or longer; the three longest

[2] This was calculated using the relative risk formula.

DOs (six, eight, and twelve words) all followed the particle. Nearly half of the DOs (twenty-three out of fifty) were two words long; they were almost evenly split between those which separated the verb and particle and those which followed the particle.

Table 7 shows the results of the analysis with all of the independent variables included in the model.

Table 7
Logistic Regression Analysis with Five Independent Variables and *Direct Object Comes Between Verb and Particle* as Dependent Variable

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	p value
Length	-0.0553	0.2019	0.7841
Stress	2.5976	1.4027	0.0640
Low Semantic Value	1.0544	1.6239	0.5162
Idea Referred To	-0.9642	0.8421	0.2522
Familiar	2.1637	0.8944	0.0156

For this model, the familiarity of the idea represented by the direct object ($p = 0.0156$) is a significant predictor at the .05 level of whether the direct object comes between the verb and the particle. However, the predictor *stress* has a p value of 0.064 and is also important. None of the other independent variables can be said to be a good predictor for the data.

Because there was one significant predictor and another predictor with a p value which just missed being significant, I created a model with only these predictors. Table 8 shows the results of the analysis with only variables *stress* and *familiar* included in the model.

Table 8
Logistic Regression Analysis with Two Independent Variables and *Direct Object Comes Between Verb and Particle* as Dependent Variable

Independent Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	p value
Stress	2.8136	1.1434	0.0139
Familiar	1.7580	0.7052	0.0127

For the model with two independent variables, both *stress* (p = 0.0139) and *familiar* (p = 0.0127) are significant. The maximized log likelihood for this model is 50.198 and the maximized log likelihood for the five-variable model is 48.3. Since the difference between the maximized log likelihoods is 1.898 (i.e. less than 7.81 with 3 degrees of freedom[3]), we can conclude that the two models are essentially the same and that both *stress* and *familiar* are significant predictors.

Discussion

The results of this study support the idea that the context in which an utterance is made plays a very important role in determining the position of a direct object relative to the parts of a phrasal verb, more important, in fact, than attributes of the direct object itself such as length. Familiarity and stress, the two factors which are, for the data in this study, significant predictors of where the DO appears, are not attributes of the DO *per se*, rather they describe it in relation to the surrounding situation and linguistic context.

Looking at the two significant factors together, we see that when the DO was stressed and was not familiar, it sometimes came between the verb and particle but not often (five out of seventeen items, 29%). An example of an item with a DO that was stressed and not familiar is Item 63. The general topic of this conversation is a recently purchased couch; the focus of the conversation has

[3] Agresti, A. (1990). *Categorical Data Analysis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons. p.506.

shifted from the appearance of the couch to its cost, the difficulties of finding it, and now to the reaction of the purchasers' older daughter to the new couch replacing an old one.

R: And we had to deal with Laura for several days.
B: Oh.
Ba: "You're not selling this couch! You're not selling this couch!"
R: I have never seen her in her entire life as upset.
Ba: I said, "Laura, you're right. I am not gonna sell this couch and chair because it's already sold. They're coming to pick it up tonight."
R: She just freaked out.
B: That's amazing.
R: Well, this was, this was all bad timing for her.
Ba: That's true.

Item 63: R: She got kicked out of her old room; she got a new baby sister; the couch, that was like the... it was finally all coming to a head here. It was just, "No, I'm not gonna accept any more changes. You are not.. I'm gonna go get that couch. I'm gonna *tear up the* ***check*** so that they can't buy the couch," and she just completely freaked out.

On the other hand, when the DO was not stressed or was familiar, it very often appeared between the verb and particle (twenty-six out of thirty-three items, 79%); in particular, for items in which the DO was not stressed and was familiar, it always appeared between the verb and particle (eight out of eight items). Item 22 is an example of a situation in which the DO was not stressed and was familiar.

R: Crawl on over here. Surprise 'em all. Crawl on over here.
Ri: Well, Bonnie had her crawling.
R: Come on.
C: We're working on it.
R: Crawl on over here.
B: That's OK.
C: She looks at Bonnie, "What did he say?"
B: See, here, let's practice again. OK, let's practice.
R: Practice.
B: Practice... hand.... knee.
R: No, no, no, not hands first.
B: Oh, I'm sorry... knee.

Item 22: R: I mean, you're gonna *stretch the kid* ***out***.

The topic of this conversation is a baby who is just about ready to start crawling but cannot quite figure out how to do it. She is on her hands and knees in the middle of a group of adults trying to encourage her and help her move her hands and knees in the right order. It was quite clear to everyone in the conversation that the child was being stretched out when her hands were moved before her knees; the DO is familiar because it was predictable in the situational context. These two examples illustrate that even though two direct objects may have the same length (two words) and the same form (definite article + unmodified common noun), they may have opposite values for the significant predictors *stress* and *familiar*, and thus may be very likely to have opposite values for the dependent variable as well.

Some of the variables in this study were chosen from the formal elements that Erades associated with lack of newsworthiness: *familiar*, *idea referred to*, and *low semantic value*. He also said that *stress* was an effect of newsworthiness. Bolinger considers stress separate from newsworthiness, but it seems to me that these are all elements a speaker may use to indicate that a piece of information is newsworthy or not. It is particularly interesting to consider all of them together: stressed DOs that are not familiar, do not have low semantic value and have not been mentioned before. There are thirteen DOs in

the data which have this particular combination of factors. Most of them, nine out of the thirteen (69%), follow a particle. Of the four that separate verb and particle (Items 26, 28, 52, and 53), three of them contain a form of the verb '*have on*'; it would be interesting to know if NSs consider this the unmarked word order for this verb. What about DOs which have all the elements that indicate they are not newsworthy? There are no DOs in the data which are unstressed, familiar, have low semantic value and have been referred to before; however, there are ten DOs which have various combinations of three of these elements. All ten of them appeared between a verb and particle; this seems to be a very clear indication that the speaker intended them to be considered not newsworthy.

Next we will look at combinations of the variables *stress* and *comes between* and Bolinger's hypothesis about the contexts in which each combination of these variables should appear. We will consider each part of the hypothesis in light of the data. There are four combinations to consider[4]:

Type I.	verb	OBJECT	particle	stressed DO comes between verb and particle
Type II.	verb	particle	OBJECT	stressed DO does not come between verb and particle
Type III.	verb	object	PARTICLE	unstressed DO comes between verb and particle
Type IV.	verb	PARTICLE	object	unstressed DO does not come between verb and particle

[4] There were no stressed verbs in the data.

Type I. Stressed DO comes between verb and particle

Bolinger (p. 54) states that in this case the action represented by the verb is familiar although it may or may not have been mentioned. Familiarity of the action represented by a verb is not a formal variable is this study; however, there are examples in the data which support this part of his hypothesis as well as counterexamples. Item 28 is an example of an action that is familiar and has been mentioned: the verb '*had on*' was said twice by the same speaker.

Item 28: M: One time we were having hobo dinners at my house and we had the outside grill, y'know, that Gary made and of course we made it in all these cans, y'know, we used to do it in cans. So Marcia was comin across the field; I couldn't figure out who was coming across the field. It was Marcia. She had an old pair of slacks on, one pant leg rolled up high, two different kinds of shoes, two different kinds of socks. She had a stick on her shoulder with a knapsack thing and she put some, she painted her face up and she put a turban on her head. What are you doing? "Well," she said, " You said it was hobo dinners." <laughter> It would take Marcia. She *had an **old** plaid shirt on* with long sleeves hangin down, y'know. She was dressed for hobo dinners.

Item 17 is an example of an action (*turn the air **conditioner** on*) that has not been mentioned but is familiar nevertheless because the speakers are discussing the temperature in a bedroom which contains an air conditioner and how to make the bedroom cooler.

G: Maybe you like to sleep in a cold room. It's about 70, 71 in there.
B: Well, Tom would like that.
Item 17: G: Well, anytime you want it to be cooler, you can just *turn the air **conditioner** on* in there.

On the other hand, Item 53 provides a counterexample to the hypothesis. It has a stressed DO between a verb and a particle, but the action is not familiar. In this situation the first speaker is being playfully attacked by a stuffed lizard wielded by the second speaker. They did not say anything to each other prior to

this item in the transcript and there was no body language to suggest the action '*bite off*.

Item 53: B: I'm gonna *bite her* ***head*** *off.* I'm gonna *bite her* ***head*** *off.*
L: No, you're not.
B: You're right; I'm not.

It is interesting to note that although Bolinger hypothesized that in this combination, the action represented by the verb would be familiar, for the data, this combination had the highest occurrence (thirteen out of eighteen, 72%) of familiar direct objects.

Type II. Stressed DO does not come between verb and particle

In this case, Bolinger considers both the verb and the direct object newsworthy, but the DO more so. Both Bolinger and Erades describe newsworthy as the opposite of familiar. Using familiar as it was defined in the Methods section, the set of Type II combinations has the lowest percentage (33%) of familiar direct objects in comparison to Types I and III, that is, it has the highest percentage of newsworthy DOs (twelve out of eighteen, 66%). (We will ignore Type IV in these comparisons because only one item has this combination.) This evidence supports Bolinger's hypothesis that a stressed DO following a particle is newsworthy. Erades' original definition of familiar included ideas which had been referred to earlier and semi-pronomial nouns. The set of Type II combinations has no DOs that are semi-pronomial nouns and only one which has low semantic value; however, about 39% (seven out of eighteen) of the DOs represent already referenced ideas i.e. they are not newsworthy, so the evidence is mixed regarding whether DOs in Type II combinations match Erades' definition of newsworthy.

Type III. Unstressed DO comes between verb and particle

Bolinger states that this combination emphasizes the verb without explicitly degrading the direct object. This means that the object may be new information, and in the data sometimes it is: Five out of thirteen (39%) of the DOs were not familiar. On the other hand, many of the DOs contained little or no new information: Six out of thirteen (46%) had low semantic value and nine out of thirteen (69%) had already been referred to. The absence of stress on a DO does not provide any more information than position alone already does about whether the DO is likely to be familiar; approximately 61% of the DOs in Type III combinations were familiar, and almost exactly the same percentage of DOs which came between verb and particle regardless of stress were familiar.

All but one of the DOs with low semantic value occurred in a Type III combination. This is an expected result because the objects with low semantic value are either pronouns or semi-pronomial nouns. They occurred where unstressed personal pronouns occur. This result supports Erades' hypothesis that semi-pronomial nouns come between verb and particle.

The percentage of DOs which represent an idea already mentioned was much higher in Type III (nine out of thirteen, 69%) than in Type I (five out of eighteen, 28%) or Type II (seven out of eighteen, 39%), supporting Erades' idea that objects representing recently mentioned ideas occur between verb and particle. These DOs are pronoun-like because they refer to something which is given within the linguistic context. Thus it is logical that they would also occur where pronouns occur.

Type IV. Unstressed DO does not come between verb and particle

According to Bolinger, the DO is redundant, that is, repetitive in this case. There is only one example (Item 35) of this combination of stress and word

order in the data, and even though on the surface it appears to support Bolinger's hypothesis, a careful examination shows that it does not.

G: Rita, aren't you gonna have a cup of coffee?
Ri: Oh, I don't know. Anybody like some cookies? Should I bring the cookies out?
G: Marge's famous cookies.
Item 35: Ri: Would you like me to *warm **up** that coffee*?
G: Don't eat them, you guys. If you eat 'em, there'll be less for me.
T: No.
Ri: No, that would be pretty awful, wouldn't it ?
T: No, it's just that I don't need it.

It appears as if the two instances of '*coffee*' in this section of the transcript refer to the same item, so that '*coffee*' in Item 35 represents an idea that has already been referred to. This would be consistent with Bolinger's hypothesis. In reality, however, the situation is different: '*that coffee*' in Item 35 refers to a new idea in the conversation and not to the same coffee mentioned three turns earlier. '*A cup of coffee*' refers to instant coffee which has not yet been made while '*that coffee*' refers to a half-empty pot of perked coffee left over from breakfast. The pot of coffee is in the kitchen, out of view of the speakers, who are in the dining room, so it has not been brought into the conversation by a glance or a gesture, either. Therefore the DO in Item 35 is not repetitive and this example does not support Bolinger's hypothesis.

For the data in this study, there is a high rate of occurrence of DOs coming between a verb and a stressed particle (thirteen out of fourteen, 93%). Item 35 is the one instance in which the DO does not come between and it is interesting to think about why this is true. One possible explanation is the unique combination of factors this item has. Other transcript items have the same combination of a stressed particle and a DO representing a new idea, but in all those cases the DO is a semi-pronomial noun or is familiar or both. Item

35 is unique in having a stressed particle and a DO which represents a new idea, is not semi-pronomial and not familiar.

Another possible explanation lies in the newsworthiness of both the verb and the object. Despite the fact that '*that coffee*' does not refer to something that was mentioned earlier in the conversation, the speaker clearly expected the hearer to know what she was asking about since she used the demonstrative determiner 'that'. The idea of a pot of coffee in the kitchen is not totally new information, but it is new to this conversation and informative in the speaker's question. The verb in this question is also new to this conversation and informative to the hearer, so there are two important pieces of information in the question. The speaker chose one way to deal with the situation: stress one important piece of information and put the other one in a prominent position at the end of the sentence (*warm **up** that coffee*). It seems as if another choice to deal with two important piece of information in a similar fashion would have been: *warm that **coffee** up*, reversing the words but leaving stress on the penultimate syntactic element; so why did the speaker place the direct object and stress where she did?

This question and the example that motivated it illustrate both a strength and a weakness of this type of study. The strength is that as a researcher and a participant in the conversations which form the basis of the study, I was able to have a great deal of information about whether ideas had already been referred to, as in the analysis of Item 35, and what the situational context was for most utterances as well as insight into what was normal under the circumstances in each situation. When discussing his research, Bolinger said, "Often the context offers no conspicuous clues, and we can only assume the ordinariness of certain actions and the familiarity of certain objects, as in the following:

It's almost ten o'clock. Put your **nightie** on, now, and run up to bed.

I shouldn't think it would take you half an hour to do this small job.---Huh. It takes that long to put the **tools** away" (p. 57).

However, I would amend this to say that often the context offers no conspicuous clues to an outside observer who is only listening to a taped conversation or reading a transcript; the context does offer a myriad of clues to the participants in the conversation. Item 22 is also a particularly good illustration of the value of the researcher being a participant in this kind of study instead of looking at data from the outside.

R: Crawl on over here. Surprise 'em all. Crawl on over here.
Ri: Well, Bonnie had her crawling.
R: Come on.
C: We're working on it.
R: Crawl on over here.
B: That's OK.
C: She looks at Bonnie, "What did he say?"
B: See, here, let's practice again. OK, let's practice.
R: Practice.
B: Practice... hand.... knee.
R: No, no, no, not hands first.
B: Oh, I'm sorry... knee.

Item 22: R: I mean, you're gonna *stretch the kid* ***out***.

Because I took part in the conversation in Item 22, it was clear to me who was referred to by the direct object of *stretch out*. However, the referent is not at all clear to someone who only reads the transcript. I asked several people to try to predict the DO from the linguistic context alone (a copy of the transcript with the direct object deleted) and they were not able to do so. In fact, three people predicted that the DO referred to an inanimate object. Even if someone who was not an observer read the transcript with the DO in place, the reader still would not know to whom *the kid* refers because the child was not mentioned by name and is not old enough to speak for herself. This familiar DO is very similar to a pronoun because it marks that a reference is made to something or somebody which is known within the situational context.

On the other hand, all the context clues surrounding '*warm **up** that coffee*' in Item 35 still do not explain why the speaker chose that particular combination of stress and word order over another, seemingly as valid choice: '*warm that **coffee** up*.' The weakness in this type of study lies, I think, in the lack of access to each speaker's thoughts and intentions. Did the speaker think that '*warm up*' and '*that coffee*' were equally newsworthy? Did she think that the action, the object or both were likely to be present in the listener's consciousness when she spoke? Were factors such as these involved in her decision to say the words in a certain order or was the choice simply idiosyncratic?

The thinking process cannot be observed directly, but one possible way to gain some insight into it is by obtaining the speakers' retrospective verbal reports of their thinking. The speakers could listen to an audio tape of themselves and answer questions about their thoughts and intentions during the taped conversation. It seems as if a verbal report study would be an interesting and beneficial method to look at speakers' aims in context in contrast to previous research which looked at the effect of word order and other factors on the hearers using sentences with little or no context.

Erades' definition of what is not newsworthy (i.e. is familiar) focuses on the hearer:

> the idea and hence the noun denoting it, should have no news value **for the hearer** (Erades, p. 58, emphasis added).

Bolinger occasionally mentions that a speaker can select a combination of word order and stress to cause a certain effect on a hearer:

> Imagine a schoolteacher whose respect for God and country has been called into question. He replies in self-defense,
>
> That's exactly the way I'm bringing these **children up**.
>
> in which *bring up* is the semantic peak but *children* still conveys new information. He also has the choice of treating *bring up* as redundant or otherwise uninformative and saying
>
> That's exactly the way I'm bringing these **children** up (p. 53-4).

However, he focuses mainly on the effect word order and stress have on the hearer:

> It seems that the effect of lack of newsworthiness, hence of familiarity, noted by Erades is due not just to the shift of the accented noun away from the end but to the shift of the unaccented particle *to* the end (p. 57).

Neither of them has emphasized the control the speaker exerts over what is treated as newsworthy or familiar. The basis of their investigations has been the formal elements of what speakers generally use to mark a piece of information as familiar, but of course there is no requirement that a speaker use any of these formal elements. As Yule (1980, p. 284) points out in a study on intonation and given/new information, the requirement is in the interpretation: the formal elements indicate what the speaker intended to have *taken* as given[5]. Givenness or lack of newsworthiness is a product of the speaker's intentions. In this paper I have discussed some common ways that speakers use to show that they intend certain pieces of information to be considered not newsworthy.

Textbook and Reference Grammar Review

The second part of this study investigates what information about separable phrasal verbs and word order is available to ESL teachers through reference grammars, pedagogical grammars, and specialized grammars for

---

[5] 'Given' and 'new' are the terms most commonly used in the literature to represent the concepts that Halliday (1967, p. 204) established: given = "predictable" and new = the part of the message which "the speaker ... wishes to be interpreted as informative". He also used the term 'newsworthy' for the latter concept.

two-word verbs. (Two-word verbs include phrasal verbs and verb-preposition combinations such as "*subscribe to*".) Specifically, the question is: What factors do grammars say are involved in selecting word order for separable phrasal verbs and direct objects that are not personal pronouns?

For this part of the study, two reference grammars, thirteen pedagogical grammars and five specialized grammars were reviewed. Most of these books specify that length of the DO is the factor that determines its placement relative to the parts of a phrasal verb. In general, authors use the adjective "long" to describe direct objects which should not separate a verb and particle; the most specific definition of "long" is "three or four words," which is mentioned in *Grammar Dimensions Two* (Riggenbach and Samuda, 1993). Only one reference grammar, *A University Grammar of English* (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1973), and one specialized grammar, *Two-Word Verbs in English* (Hook, 1981), mention how context affects word order. Two books, *Mastering American English: A Handbook-Workbook of Essentials* (Hayden, Pilgrim, and Haggard, 1956) and *Phrasal Verbs in Conversation* (Mortimer, 1982), cover phrasal verbs but offer no explanation for when a verb and particle can be separated and when they can be adjacent. Several of the more advanced general textbooks, including the two highest textbooks in the *Grammar Dimensions* series, the advanced textbook in the *Focus on Grammar* series, and *The Advanced Grammar Book* (Steer and Carlisi, 1991), do not cover phrasal verbs.

Reference Grammars

A University Grammar of English (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1973) states that "for most separable phrasal verbs," the particle can precede or follow a direct object which is not a personal pronoun, but 'most' is not specified in any

more detail. "Rarely, with contrastive stress," a personal pronoun may follow the particle (p. 348). It goes on to say, "The particle tends to precede the object if the object is long or if the intention is that the object should receive end-focus." End-focus is defined as the "tendency to place new information towards the end of the clause" (p. 410). The topic is mentioned again in a chapter about focus, theme and emphasis, which states that there is a "free interchange" (p. 424) between a particle and a direct object which is not a pronoun and that end-weight[6] and end-focus determine the choice.

Modern English: A Practical Reference Guide (Frank, 1972) mentions that, in addition to the fact that personal pronouns must be placed between a verb and its particle when the verb is separable, "other types of pronouns are also usually placed between the two parts of a separable verb--**put *this* on**, **pick *one*** (or ***some, a few***) **out**--but, sometimes **pick out *one***. " (p. 177) It also states that if an NP object has "long modification", the verb and particle are not separated. 'Long' is not defined, but two examples are given:

> *Take off* ***those tight shoes that are hurting you so much.***
>
> *We must break down* ***all the figures that might be questioned by the auditor.***

Pedagogical Grammars

Each book in the *Grammar Dimensions* series was reviewed. In *Grammar Dimensions One*, the beginning level book (Badalamenti and Henner-Stanchina, 1993), the authors note that many phrasal verbs can be separated by a noun object (p. 293) without mentioning the circumstances in which this can happen. They give the following example:

> I **handed out** the evaluation forms.
>
> I **handed** the evaluation forms **out**.

---

[6] End-weight is the "tendency to reserve the final position for the more complex parts of a clause or sentence" (p. 410)

They also state that a pronoun always comes before a particle; the example given contains the pronoun *them*, and in the exercise all the pronouns for the students to manipulate are *it* or *them*.

Grammar Dimensions Two (Riggenbach and Samuda, 1993), a low-intermediate book, is more specific than the beginning level book about when a noun object can separate a phrasal verb. If the NP is "longer than three or four words, it sounds better if the phrasal verb is **not** separated" (p. 279, their emphasis). The example given has a DO that is eight words long.

> AWKWARD: Last week Sharifah went through her closet and **threw** all the clothes that were several years old **out**.
>
> CORRECT: She **threw** her old clothes **out**.
>
> CORRECT: She **threw out** her old clothes.

The authors mention the position of a pronoun relative to a particle and give an example with a personal pronoun.

The intermediate to high-intermediate and advanced books in this series, *Grammar Dimensions Three* (Thewlis, 1993) and *Grammar Dimensions Four* (Frodesen and Eyring, 1993), contain no information about word order with phrasal verbs.

Each textbook in the *Focus on Grammar* series was reviewed. The basic level book (Schoenberg, 1994) explains, "When the direct object is a noun, it can go after the particle or between the verb and particle" and "when the direct object is a pronoun, it always goes between the verb and the particle" (p. 401). Examples and exercises use no pronouns other than personal pronouns. The high-intermediate level book (Fuchs and Bonner, 1995) includes a unit on phrasal verbs. It states that "if the direct object is a pronoun, it must go between the verb and the particle"; a grammar note mentions that noun objects can go before or after the particle, but when "the noun object is part of a long phrase"

(p. 341) the verb is not separated. The longest example of a noun object separating a verb and particle is:

> I just **dreamed** a new idea **up**.

An example of a noun object that should not separate a verb and particle is:

> She **tried out** a new and complicated device for developing photographs.

The advanced book in this series (Maurer, 1995) does not cover phrasal verbs.

Fundamentals of English Grammar (Azar, 1992) is an intermediate-level textbook. It describes word order with phrasal verbs as follows (p. 241):

> Many phrasal verbs are **separable**. In other words, a NOUN can either follow or come between (separate) the verb and the particle.
>
> (b) We put off our trip.
> (c) We put our trip off.
>
> (b) and (c) have the same meaning.
>
> If a phrasal verb is **separable**, the PRONOUN always comes between the verb and the particle; the pronoun never follows the particle.

All the phrasal verb examples and exercises that use pronouns contain personal pronouns.

Understanding and Using English Grammar (Azar, 1989) is an advanced grammar textbook by the same author as the one just mentioned. It discusses phrasal verbs only in an appendix and repeats the information given in the intermediate-level book in a slightly more condensed form.

In *The Advanced Grammar Book* (Steer and Carlisi, 1991), the authors present phrasal verbs in sample authentic texts which the students read and analyze and in examples, but they do not explain them.

Rapid Review of English Grammar (Praninskas, 1975) is somewhat more specific about the placement of NP direct objects than the previously mentioned textbooks. The author presents the following rules and examples (p. 217):

1. Short noun objects which are not modified by a phrase or a clause may occur between the two parts of the verb or after the second part.

   Professor Baker called his secretary up.
   Professor Baker called up his secretary.

2. Long noun objects including phrases or clauses never split the two-word verb. They occur after it.

   Professor Baker called up the lady who works in his office.

3. Pronoun objects always occur between the two parts of a separable two-word verb.

   Professor Baker called her up.

In the intermediate/advanced level textbook, *Using English, Your Second Language* (Danielson and Hayden, 1973), the authors are more specific than most others in saying when an NP direct object may not separate a verb and particle. They say that a verb and its particle are usually adjacent when the direct object has a long clause or phrase modifier (p. 151). The example given contains a reduced relative clause.

The president **called** the meeting **off**.

The president **called off** the meeting scheduled for four o'clock.

This textbook also mentions that if the object is a pronoun, it always occurs between the verb and preposition (p. 149). The second edition of this book (Danielson and Porter with Hayden, 1990) adds that the particle receives heavier stress than the verb, while in a verb + preposition combination, the verb gets heavier stress (p. 166).

Mastering American English: A Handbook-Workbook of Essentials (Hayden, Pilgrim, and Haggard, 1956), another intermediate/advanced grammar, states in the text that the possible word orders are [verb, preposition/adverb, noun object] and [verb, pronoun object, preposition/adverb], then includes a footnote:

> A noun object may also be placed between the verb and preposition-adverb in most situations; however, in learning to use the combinations on this list, it may be simpler to place the noun object *after* the preposition-adverb because there seems to be a tendency to place it in this position. (p. 183)

Specialized Grammars

On Stage with English (Gilman, 1988) is aimed toward high-beginning and low-intermediate learners and focuses on phrasal verbs. Various exercises reinforce the verbs, including choosing objects which can be used with particular verbs, for example:

> The boys picked [Ø, the girls, the birthday cake, her, it, the laundry from the cleaners*, the pizza] up before the party.

The item above is from Exercise 5 in Lesson 3 (p. 38), the directions for which state, "With separable two-word verbs, the pronoun objects must come between the verb and the p/p. The noun objects can go between or after the p/p," where p/p means preposition or particle. The asterisk in this item indicates a footnote which states, "Long noun phrases like this usually go after the p/p. You may want to draw arrows to show the correct position for pronouns and long phrases that are misplaced in the exercise." No definition of 'long' is given and this point is not mentioned elsewhere in the book even though there are other exercises with as long or longer phrases between the verb and its particle. For example:

> Please turn [Ø, the music, your stereo, the lights, the fire, the front burner on the stove, it, the volume, him] down. (p. 110)

Phrasal Verbs in Conversation (Mortimer, 1972) is intended for high-intermediate and advanced students. Apart from a short introduction, it consists entirely of dialogues and drills, each focusing on one phrasal verb. Some of the drills indicate that the particle can occur before or after the direct object; for example,

> It's very rude to stick (out) your tongue (out). (p. 179)

However, other examples of separable phrasal verbs do not indicate this.

> All that remains for me to do is to try to sum up the arguments. (p. 181)

In the introduction the author mentions,

> "Though the particle *can* often be used in two positions, this does not mean that, in natural speech, it always *is* used equally often in the two positions, or that to use it in one rather than the other position does not sometimes cause a slight shift in meaning or emphasis. Until more research has been done into the subject, experience must be our guide here." (p. vi)

This book never mentions pronouns, but some of the dialogues use personal pronouns as direct objects.

In Lesson 3, *The Key to English Two Word Verbs* (Brockman and Jones, 1964) states that phrasal verbs are "peculiar in that they *allow* their two parts to be separated by short noun objects and *require* that they be so separated when the direct object is an unstressed personal pronoun." (p. 18) There is no mention of what 'short' means, but in a later lesson the authors note,

> If the noun object is very long, however, English speakers avoid putting it between the two parts of the verb.
>
> I put on *the hat I had bought the day before*.
> *Not:* I put the hat I had bought the day before on.
>
> It is difficult to make a rule on this, except that nouns with following modifiers are not ordinarily placed between the parts of the two-word verb. In case of doubt, the student should let the noun object follow the two parts of the verb, since that word order is always correct. (p. 50-1)

Two-Word Verbs in English (Hook, 1981) has a slightly more specific definition of 'long'; it states that if an object is "several words long" (p. 95), it usually should not separate the verb and particle. Two examples are given:

Clear:	I could *tune up* THE OLD ENGINES THAT NEED TO BE REPAIRED.
Confusing, awkward:	I could *tune* THE OLD ENGINES THAT NEED TO BE REPAIRED *up*.
Clear:	The company *laid off* ABOUT THIRTY OF ITS NEWEST WORKERS last week.
Confusing, awkward:	The company *laid* ABOUT THIRTY OF ITS NEWEST WORKERS *off* last week.

The book also mentions, "When a pronoun like *it* or *them* is the object of a separable verb, it always goes between the parts" (p. 3). This is the only book which mentions the effect of context when it states that separable verbs "pronounce the second word a little more strongly" with the exception that "if the object names something not mentioned before, stress that object" (p. 12).

When discussing word order, the textbook *Using Phrasal Verbs* (McArthur, 1975) does not mention the length or complexity of the direct object, rather it states, "When a sentence is short, it is usual to place the particle AFTER the object noun. *There is no difference in meaning.*" (p. 11) (I assume that the word 'sentence' should actually be 'object noun'; however, since word order is not discussed anywhere else in the book, this cannot be confirmed.) There is no mention of what 'short' means; following the sentence above, there are example sentences for the student to modify by placing the particle after the direct object. The longest sentence in this example contains twelve words with a five-word direct object:

> The child was asked to pick up all the bits of paper.

Conclusions

The results of the first part of this study support the idea that the word order of separable phrasal verbs and direct objects follows the principle that nonnewsworthy information generally precedes newsworthy information in utterances. For the data in the study, the best predictors of word order were stress and familiarity of the direct object, that is, predictability from the linguistic or situational context or a combination of the two. We saw that familiar DOs were likely to separate a verb and particle and unfamiliar ones were not, and that stressed particles were likely to follow a DO. We also saw that although low semantic value of the DO was not a significant predictor of word order for the

data, pronouns which are not personal pronouns and semi-pronomial nouns generally follow the pattern of personal pronouns and separate verb and particle. Although we cannot generalize based on the data of this one study, it does seem unfortunate that grammar textbook authors have consistently failed to mention the principle that nonnewsworthy information generally precedes newsworthy information when they present the topic of word order and separable phrasal verbs.

References

Azar, B. (1992). *Fundamentals of English Grammar, Second Edition.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Regents/Prentice Hall, Inc.

Azar, B. (1989). *Understanding and Using English Grammar, Second Edition.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Regents/Prentice Hall, Inc.

Badalamenti, V. and Henner-Stanchina, C. (1993). *Grammar Dimensions One.* Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.

Bolinger, D. (1971). *The Phrasal Verb in English.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bonner, M. (1995). *Focus on Grammar: A High-Intermediate Course for Reference and Practice, Teacher's Manual.* New York: Longman.

Brockman, E. W. and Jones, W. (1964). *The Key to English Two-Word Verbs.* New York: Collier Macmillan.

Danielson, D. and Hayden, R. (1973). *Using English, Your Second Language.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Danielson, D. and Porter, P. with Hayden, R. (1990). *Using English, Your Second Language, Second Edition.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Erades, P. (1961). Points of Modern English Syntax. *English Studies: A Journal of English Letters and Philology, 42*(1), 56-60.

Frank, M. (1972). *Modern English: A Practical Reference Guide.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Fraser, B. (1976). *The Verb-Particle Combination in English.* New York: Academic Press.

Frodesen, J. and Eyring, J. (1993). *Grammar Dimensions Four.* Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.

Fuchs, M. and Bonner, M. (1995). *Focus on Grammar: A High-Intermediate Course for Reference and Practice.* New York: Longman.

Gilman, C. (1988). *On Stage with English: Spotlighting Two-Word Verb Idioms.* New York: Collier Macmillan.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1967). Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English: Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics 3,* 199-244.

Hayden, R. E., Pilgrim, D. W., and Haggard, A. Q. (1956). *Mastering American English: A Handbook-Workbook of Essentials.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hook, J. N. (1981). *Two-Word Verbs in English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Kruisinga, E. and Erades, P. (1967). *An English Grammar: Volume I, Accidence and Syntax, Ninth Edition.* Groningen: P. Noordhoff N.V.

Maurer, J. (1995). *Focus on Grammar: An Advanced Course for Reference and Practice.* New York: Longman.

McArthur, T. (1975). *Using Phrasal Verbs.* London: Collins.

Mortimer, C. (1972). *Phrasal Verbs in Conversation*. London: Longman.

Praninskas, J. (1975). *Rapid Review of English Grammar, Second Edition*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Quirk, R. and Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Rietveld, T. and van Hout, R. (1993). *Statistical Techniques for the Study of Language and Language Behaviour*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Riggenbach, H. and Samuda, V. (1993). *Grammar Dimensions Two*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.

Schoenberg, I. (1994). *Focus on Grammar: A Basic Course for Reference and Practice*. New York: Longman.

Steer, J. and Carlisi, K. (1991). *The Advanced Grammar Book*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.

Thewlis, S. (1993). *Grammar Dimensions Three*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle.

Yule, G. (1980). Intonation and Givenness in Spoken Discourse. *Studies in Language* 4 (2), 271-286.

Appendix A: Transcriptions

Bold type indicates heaviest relative stress among the verb, particle and direct object.

(Tape 1, Side A)

1. B: What's this?
C: Candy.
G: Candy...from Poland.
B: "Truffle Candy, Product of Poland."
G: Yeah. *Pass it **around**.*

2. G: Have you ever eaten a regular truffle? Not...the, uh...
T: Well, I don't think ...
G: Or isn't it edible?
T: Yeah, it's edible, but it, but it's so expensive that they take it and *chop it all **up*** in little, teeny **pieces** and put it in soups and stuff.

3. G: That book that you sent me, Cyndie, Bonnie, uh, the Polish Christmas thing, y'know? Oh, Father Ken thought that was the greatest thing in the world. He really...
B: Oh, good.
G: In fact, he took the name of the publisher and everything, and he said ...
C: Did you ever *find out **anything*** about that book that I sent for you for? Did you write to the publisher or anything?

4. C: The breeze feels good.
Ri: Yeah, that breeze coming in this family room is great.
G: Well, what I think we'll do is *turn off the air **conditioner*** in that bedroom
5. so it ain't too cold for you and *open up the **window.***

6. (The Legs Inn, to which "the place" refers, was mentioned several minutes earlier; the intervening conversation was on a different topic.)
R: No one could *figure out the significance of the **name** of the place* so I finally had to ask. Thought maybe it had some...
B: What was the name of it?
R: The Legs Inn. Thought maybe it had some sordid past or something.
B: So, what was...
R: Wasn't to be. When it was built, along the roof line as part of the, I don't
7. know, the joists or whatever, that *hold up the **roof*** or come out from there, you could see these pieces of pipe, bent pieces of pipe, like pipe legs or whatever. That's where the place got its name.

8. R: Could one of you get a ride?
Ri: Maybe I could convince Alice to come and *pick me **up*** for a change.

9. G: What'd you do, miss supper today?
R: Right.
G: How come?
R: I was *running people* ***around.***

10. R: But if that was the case, I'd have to change days off at work and I don't know if I can do that ... although there's really gonna be nobody takin my place anyway so it might not make that much difference.
G: Well, why can't you settle that question?
Ri: Why, OK, why would you go a different day? I thought you *took off* ***Thursday***? Were you going to go Thursday then?
R: No, because they're going down tomorrow night and then we would go down Wednesday.
Ri: Oh, tomorrow's Tuesday.
11. R: Cuz I *took off* ***Thursday*** way back when to do this because that's what
12. the... the day that Barb said that's the only day we could go so I *took it* ***off.***
Ri: And there's no way to switch?
R: Well, not really, but I have to talk to J. tomorrow; she wasn't there today. It probably won't make any difference because there's no one that would take my place anyway. I mean, the day I'm gonna be gone, there's gonna be no one working the CIS desk; they just won't. So it isn't really gonna make a whole lotta difference. There's nobody else that can do that.
13. G: So you can *find that* ***out*** tomorrow, you said.

14. Ri: Now, what happens to Laura?
R: Laura stays with Ida; we talked about that already. That's not a problem.
Ri: But she'd have to be picked up at 5:00, right?
R: Well, whenever you want to *pick her* ***up***.
15. Ri: By 5. Well, it's no problem if I just have to get Laura. *Pick her* ***up*** or stay at her house?
R: We'll probably be home fairly late.

16. G: I guess what I wanna know is what happens if you decide on this, to do it on Wednesday, let's say, or whatever day, and it's rainin' cats and dogs in the morning, what happens?
R: Well, it could be totally different weather in Ann Arbor.
Ri: What if it isn't?
G: You're going rain or shine?
R: I imagine.
Ri: Well, that's not what Cyndie said.
R: How ya gonna know?
G: Well, you're gonna know, but you sure ain't gonna enjoy a fair, y'know, if it's rainin.
C: I'm not gonna *take* ***Jennifer*** *out* if it's pouring rain. I just won't go. (The speaker is talking about her six-month old daughter.)

17. G: Maybe you like to sleep in a cold room. It's about 70, 71 in there.
B: Well, Tom would like that.
G: Well, anytime you want it to be cooler, you can just *turn the air* ***conditioner*** *on* in there.

18. G: Let's go in the family room, where it's cooler.... Oh, Bonnie *set up the* ***recorder*** in here; I forgot.

(Tape 1, Side B)

19. G: But the Indians carried their kids that way.
R: Or on their front, I'm not sure which.
Ri: They used to have that thing on the back, remember?
G: Yeah, the Indians, it was on the back...
Ri: With poles
G: That was gonna be my next question, well, what's the difference between the back and the front?
R: There are frontpacks, too.
Ri: There are frontpacks.
G: But, I mean,
Ri: Is that for a smaller child, or?
R: Generally speaking, yes. But I *tried the frontpack* ***on*** and.. no way.

20. R: The backpack worked fine. I mean, that's what, when we took Laura to New York basically I wore her in the backpack pretty much the whole time we were boppin around New York.
G: How old was she then?
B: She was about...
R: She was six months old. She wasn't quite this big...
B: Yeah, I was gonna say...
R: But that was kind of an old-fashioned backpack too, and it wasn't very light. They have 'em now with little wheels on them. You can *take 'em* ***off*** and wheel 'em. It's like a two-wheeled stroller.

21. G: Again, going back to "Rescue 911"; they had a series where they were dealing with preemie babies. There's a hospital. Where was that? Was it in Houston or someplace? One of the bigger cities where that's their specialty... all these babies that are born real early and have trouble and are born with trouble. Geez. To see 'em handle... those doctors handling these little bodies about that big and they got all kinds of wires and tape and everything...wow! But I guess it's marvelous what they can do for 'em. And you look at the thing and you say well... they say we're gonna hafta *open up that* ***baby***; there's a heart problem.

22. (The topic is a baby who is playing on the floor.)
R: Crawl on over here. Surprise 'em all. Crawl on over here.
Ri: Well, Bonnie had her crawling.
R: Come on.
C: We're working on it.
R: Crawl on over here.
B: That's OK.
C: She looks at Bonnie, "What did he say?"
B: See, here, let's practice again. OK, let's practice.
R: Practice.
B: Practice... hand.... knee.
R: No, no, no, not hands first.
B: Oh, I'm sorry... knee.
R: I mean, you're gonna *stretch the kid **out***.

23. R: She has to be the one to call in like to the skating club phone and get all the messages and then she has to *call all these people **back***.

(Tape 2, Side A)

24. M: When we made it at home, I think we used to make it from... uh... what was the beef that they had with the little ribs in?
Ri: Um, short, short ribs.
M: Short ribs. Yeah. And those little square...
Ri: It's good every once in a while.
G: Weren't those short ribs that you made in the crock pot?
Ri: No, those were country ribs.
M: But when we had it, y'know, there was a lot of fat on it and stuff like that..
Ri: And we ate it.
M: Oh, that was the best part of the whole meat. Now you look at it..."*Throw that **away***; you can't eat it."

25,26,27,28. M: One time we were having hobo dinners at my house and we had the outside grill, y'know, that Gary made and of course we made it in all these cans, y'know, we used to do it in cans. So Marcia was comin across the field; I couldn't *figure out **who** was coming across the **field.*** It was Marcia. She *had an **old** pair of slacks on*, one pant leg rolled up high, two different kinds of shoes, two different kinds of socks. She had a stick on her shoulder with a knapsack thing and she put some, she *painted her face **up*** and she put a turban on her head. What are you doing? "Well," she said, " You said it was hobo dinners." <laughter> It would take Marcia. She *had an **old** plaid shirt on* with long sleeves hangin down, y'know. She was dressed for hobo dinners.

29. M: She was tellin me this morning Scott's got this old white car out in the yard that... well, he bought it cuz he didn't want to take his Corvette out of the garage, he would have had...

Ri: Scott's got a Corvette?

M: Oh, yeah. He didn't want to *take it* ***out*** because he wanted to do some work on it first, so he bought this old, used car.

30. (discussing childhood trips to a certain store)

B: I don't remember getting a hot dog.

C: Oh, I do, cuz I remember I used to *peel the* ***skin*** *off.*

31. G: There aren't too many places where you can shop like you used to.

M: The other day I was trying to *figure out* ***what*** *the name of that little grocery store* ***was*** *where* ***Nickel's*** *is.*

32. G: But Houston is such a... you're in Houston; you're out of Houston; "Now leaving Houston"; "Now entering Houston".

Ri: It goes like this.

C: Oh, yeah. All of 'em do.

G: So...

C: Pasadena and all of 'em.

G: jagged. You don't see that around Detroit, for example.

C: No, I mean, if you looked at the maps, you could see, I mean, the city limits goes like...

Ri: Yeah.

C: this.

Ri: It's really strange. You'd think they'd *block it* ***off***, y'know.

33. G: I looked out there to see who the priest was and that's how bad my eyes are, I didn't know it was G. Did you see him?

Ri: You looked out in where?

G: When he was standing by the door of the sacristy.

Ri: No, I didn't look over there.

G: Oh, I looked.

Ri: When he came in, you said, "Is that Father G?"

G: Oh, when he came in, yeah. He walked over the <unintelligible>.

Ri: I noticed you *took your* ***glasses*** *off* to read today in church.

34. G: Rita, aren't you gonna have a cup of coffee?

Ri: Oh, I don't know. Anybody like some cookies? Should I *bring the cookies* ***out***?

G: Marge's famous cookies.

("That coffee" in the next line refers to a pot of coffee made several hours earlier; "a cup of coffee" above refers to instant coffee.)

35. Ri: Would you like me to *warm* ***up*** *that coffee*?

G: Don't eat them, you guys. If you eat 'em, there'll be less for me.

T: No.

Ri: No, that would be pretty awful, wouldn't it ?

T: No, it's just that I don't need it.

M: You mean the ones that she brought home a week ago from golfing?

G: Well, we were saving 'em.

Ri: I tried to save 'em for company but he ate most of 'em.

G: Not most of 'em, some of 'em. Marge would be disappointed if I didn't eat 'em.

M: That's right. You betcha. I brought some more today, George.

G: I know you brought lettuce.

M: You gotta bake 'em though. I brought cookies that are...

Ri: You want to, you want a cup of coffee; I understand that's why he's asking...

M: They're called, yeah, Icebox Cookies or Refrigerator Cookies.

G: That's what you forgot the other day.

M: Yeah.

C: Oh, you slice 'em.

M: You slice 'em and bake 'em. Never made 'em before, so whatever comes out, you're on your own.

B: Well, I figure if you can't experiment on your friends and family, who can you experiment on?

M: That's right.

C: How long do you bake 'em and what temperature?

M: You're on your own.

G: That's what's called experimenting.

B: Well, it must be 350.

M: I didn't make these.

T: Really?

36. G: Well, I'll have one, but I have to take one of these to *chase it* ***down.***

37. M: It's like when we have something at church and they'll *pass the **paper** around* at the Altar Society meeting and say, "We're going to need cookies. Who would like to make cookies?" One says, "Well, I'm not gonna bake," and another one says, "I don't know... I don't make good cookies," and it goes on. Someone... there'll be '1 dozen', '2 dozen', '1 dozen', '2 dozen'. When it comes by me, I'll put '5 dozen.' "You gonna make 5 dozen cookies?" Well, a batch makes almost that.

Ri: Yeah, right. You don't hardly eat any yourself, so...

M: No, I mean ...

C: Well, those people obviously aren't gonna make 'em.

M: No, they're gonna buy a dozen cookies.

C: Yeah.

T: Sure.

Ri: Or, they're gonna make 'em and give the rest to their family or something if they're gonna bake cookies.

C: Well, probably not.

T: No.

T: Probably buy 'em.

38. M: I betcha they're gonna buy a package of cookies. Yeah. Of course, it's over with and done, but I meant I always *put down '5 **dozen**.'*

C: Sure, why not?

39. M: We had, we had a meal over at the VFW Hall when we were makin money to fight this landfill that went through, y'know. You probably heard all about that a hundred times, but.. and we had a chicken dinner and we served cookies and I *put down there '10 **dozen cookies**.'*

40. B: Y'know, like you make spritz cookies with. Some little attachment that makes this round <unintelligible> about this big around and you just go ----, *cut it **off***, ----, *cut it **off***...boy, that's fast.

41. C: You could really make those candy canes that Mom makes.
Ri: Oh, yeah.
C: With the 2 different colors; you could *cut 'em all* ***off*** like that and then just take...
B: Oh, yeah, I suppose they'd be a little fat.
M: Well, stretch it.
B: You'd have to stretch it or something.
Ri: I wonder if you could do crescents.
C: Yeah, cut 'em shorter.
B: Oh, you could absolutely do crescents that way.
Ri: You could do crescents, couldn't you?
42. C: Make 'em a little shorter and *stretch 'em* ***out.***
Ri: They'd be a little skinny maybe though for crescents.
B: No, it'd be good for crescents.
G: Well, those canes are a nice-looking cookie but they don't taste as good as they look.
B: Oh, I think they taste great.
C: I like 'em.
Ri: That's the one John likes too, with the anise flavor.
B: Oh, I love anise.
Ri: If you put, if you do it right and make anise flavor on the red.
B: I'm always disappointed when somebody makes 'em and they put peppermint and I kind of go, "oooh."
C: That isn't right.
M: Well, they, they're thinking of candy canes.
B: Sure, yeah.
43,44. Ri: There is a recipe that you *crush up* ***peppermint*** and put it on, candies and put it on top. But I like it with the anise flavor too. But I don't make them very often because it takes a long time. You gotta rub the red and rub the white and *roll 'em* ***together.***

45. G: You gotta go?
C: Pretty soon here.
B: Well, maybe you could *drop us* ***off*** at the library for a while on your way.
C: You two?
B: Yeah, is that alright?
C: Yeah.
G: Well, I can take you with the other car, too.
B: Oh, that's alright, I mean, she's gonna go.
G: I don't know when they're gonna call me today. They said it would be...
B: Well, she's going so...
Ri: Cuz it looks like you might get caught in the rain if you try to walk or something.
M: No, just... no
46. B: She can *pick us* ***up*** on the way back.
47. M: No, just set a time and then your dad'll go *pick you* ***up***.
Ri: Yeah, right.
M: Say, well, we're gonna be there 'til .. and then he'll be there.
G: I'm gonna try and talk this guy into, when he calls, into driving...
Ri: Coming for you.
48. G: Coming and *bringing the* ***car*** *up*.

49. G: Bonnie, tell me what time you wanna be picked up.
B: Oh, Cyndie will *pick us* ***up***.

(Tape 2, Side B)

50. (discussing baby backpack)
R: Can I *take this thing* ***off*** now?
Ba: If you want to.
R: No, I'd rather sit here with it on.
51. Ba: Do you want to *put* ***Jennifer*** *in* so you can see what it feels like?

52. (Jennifer is now in the baby backpack)
R: Hang on to my neck; yeah, hang on to my ears.
C: She looks pretty happy.
R: Grab my ears. Wait a minute; I don't *have the* ***waist*** *thing on.*

53. (playing with stuffed lizard)
B: I'm gonna *bite her* ***head*** *off.* I'm gonna *bite her* ***head*** *off.*
L: No, you're not.
B: You're right; I'm not.

54,55. C: Well, let's go to the market now that you got her in there.
Ba: You'll get all sorts of stares if you *take this* ***down*** and *wheel her* ***around***.

56. Ba: You almost need a rear-view mirror to see...
C: <laughter> yeah.
Ba: There's probably some kind of a bicycle mirror.
B: Yeah, right. You could *hook it* ***up*** to your glasses. That's where they wear 'em.

57. R: You need to tie this.
Ba: Do you want a strap?
R: She's got a strap.
C: I don't know. I've got a strap, but I *took it* ***off*** because she was laying down.
58. B: The one problem we had with Emily with the straps was that she was doing this with her arms all the time and she *yanks it* ***out***.

59. C: What did you tell 'em?
B: I just told 'em we were gonna come over and talk about it and I didn't say anything about being videotaped or not being videotaped.
Ba: Don't they want to be videotaped?
C: Neither one of them wants to.
B: Well, we'll just try. I'll take the audio tape too and see if we can get em going on something <unintelligible>
C: What about Aunt Alice?
Ba: ...just get them talking.
B: I didn't have time to talk to everybody about everything. I just *set up a* ***time***. If they're all there, fine, if they're not, that's fine too.
60. Ba: You can just *set the tripod* ***up*** and just talk to them.

61. Ba: It will cost as much as the couch.
R: It'll cost.. no, Barb, it'll cost more than the couch. It'll cost $300 more than the couch.
B: How much did the couch cost?
R: A thousand.
T: That's pretty good.
B: That's good for a couch.
Ba: That's why we bought it.
R: Right. That's right, cuz it was supposed to be like twenty-five hundred dollars.
Ba: And it was sitting...
R: They had it back in the clearance room.
Ba: It was sitting in the clearance area.
R: They didn't know what to do with it.
Ba: I went to look for rocking chairs and spotted it back there and all the furniture was pushed up against it. I said, "I'd like to sit back there; *try that* ***out*** and see." There was just enough for me to squeeze in.

62. R: And we had to deal with Laura for several days.
B: Oh.
Ba: "You're not selling this couch! You're not selling this couch!"
R: I have never seen her in her entire life as upset.
Ba: I said, "Laura, you're right. I am not gonna sell this couch and chair because it's already sold. They're coming to *pick it* ***up*** tonight."
R: She just freaked out.
B: That's amazing.
R: Well, this was, this was all bad timing for her.
Ba: That's true.

63. R: She got kicked out of her old room; she got a new baby sister; the couch, that was like the... it was finally all coming to a head here. It was just, "No, I'm not gonna accept any more changes. You are not.. I'm gonna go get that couch. I'm gonna *tear up the* ***check*** so that they can't buy the couch," and she just completely freaked out.

64. Ba: But you know why she didn't like this couch is she can't crawl over the top of it.
R: Well, she can.
Ba: Well, she disc.., she discovered that she can do fun things with the arms.
R: Yeah, she discovered the arms are pretty fun. But she just totally, she totally lost it. I mean, we had to put her up in her room, and practically *tie her* ***down*** and she was just freakin out.

(Tape 3, Side A)

65. (discussing old photographs and a forthcoming anniversary party)
C: What about this?
Re: If anyone wants it, they can have it.
C: You sure?
Re: Um hm.
C: OK. We might be able to use it again.
B: Yeah, we'll take that and put it on.. we'll *put a board of* ***pictures*** *up* at the party.

66. (eating cheese and crackers)
Re: Oh, I *got some* ***plates*** *out* there; see 'em?

67. M: What's the matter?
Re: Crackers aren't as fresh as I thought they were.
M: They don't crunch?
Re: They don't really crunch.
M: Put 'em in the microwave. *Freshen 'em* ***up***.

68. (earlier conversation was about Rita's wedding photos)
B: What year did you get married?
M: 1939.
C: Was it the tradition in those days that the bride's father *gave her* ***away***? Did they do that?
Re: No.
69. M: Did Dad *give* ***Rita*** *away*?
Re: No.

70. Re: I know the first one I remember someone walking up the aisle was when Karen got married, Grandpa walked up the aisle with her, cuz Roman was dead. But they were doin' it probably before that, but that's the only one, the first one I remember.
M: Because it was so great to have Grandpa do it, really, y'know to have Grandpa *give a* ***grandchild*** *away*.
Re: Yeah, but by the time she got married, they were starting doin' that.
71. M: Lawrence was really disappointed. He was hoping and thinking that he might be able to do that cuz he never had a daughter and he knew that Roman was gone and he thought that sure he could... he was gonna be able to *give* ***Karen*** *away*.

72. M: I bake anything long as it's not with yeast. I don't like makin' rolls or biscuits, I mean, um, bread, coffeecake. I tried a couple times and I don't know if I punch it too much that, that it won't raise or what; it's just like a glob of dough.
Re: Punch the life out of it. I can't bake bread either. Mum showed me so many times. She'd tell me how, how hot to have, how warm to have the yeast, so I'd do that and I'd put it in there and it'd raise beautiful. But when I come to make the loaves... I just didn't have that knack. She'd go like this... no... she'd roll it like that and *pat it* ***down***, y'know, and I just couldn't do it the right way, 'cuz mine always came out coarse.

73. M: When you turn off of Ionia onto Raymond, it's the third house on the lefthand side.
B: I'll *point it* ***out*** to you.

74. (discussing how much food a baby should be eating and the baby's size; this baby and Emily are cousins of about the same age)
Re: I knew, I *picked her* ***up*** there just before I left the other day and I said, "I wouldn't want to carry her very far."
75,76. B: Yeah, I *pick her* ***up*** and then you *pick* ***Emily*** *up* and it's like...
77. M: You *pick* ***Emily*** *up* and you go, "Woooo."
<laughter>
B: There's not enough of this baby. She's too small.

78. M: But you look at those great big car seats...
C: Yeah, right.
M: And this double stroller that they got for their shower and then you think of when is that gonna fit in there?
C: Right, yeah, it'll be a while. Even when Jennifer was born she was big, those car seats, they just, y'know, the babies just kinda slump down in there. They don't make a good car seat for little, small newborns.
B: Well, I guess if you're a good mom, you just stay home and never *take the newborn baby* ***out***.
M: That's about it.

79. C: There's not much room on those planes. The plane was packed. Every seat was full. Well, and I told you they were asking people to *give up their* ***seats*** so...

80. Re: We held... When Ruth and I came back with Ernie and Marianne, when we flew back from Alaska, there was a fella coming across from Korea and he had, he *brought back two* ***babies*** and of course it was for adoption.

Appendix B

Variable Values for Transcript Items with Direct Objects that are not Personal Pronouns

Item Number (from transcript)	*DO comes between Verb and Particle*	*Length of DO in Words*	*Stress*	*Low Semantic Value*	*Idea Referred to*	*Familiar*
3	no	1	DO	yes	no	no
4	no	3	DO	no	no	no
5	no	2	DO	no	no	yes
6	no	8	DO	no	no	no
7	no	2	DO	no	yes	yes
9	yes	1	particle	yes	no	no
10	no	1	DO	no	no	no
11	no	1	DO	no	yes	no
13	yes	1	particle	yes	yes	no
16	yes	1	DO	no	no	yes
17	yes	3	DO	no	no	yes
18	no	2	DO	no	no	no
19	yes	2	particle	no	yes	yes
21	no	2	DO	no	yes	yes
22	yes	2	particle	no	yes	yes
23	yes	3	particle	yes	no	yes
24	yes	1	particle	yes	yes	no
25	no	6	DO	no	yes	no
26	yes	5	DO	no	no	no
27	yes	2	particle	no	no	yes
28	yes	4	DO	no	no	no
30	yes	2	DO	no	no	yes
31	no	12	DO	no	no	no
33	yes	2	DO	no	no	yes
34	yes	2	particle	no	yes	yes
35	no	2	particle	no	no	no

Item Number (from transcript)	*DO comes between Verb and Particle*	*Length of DO in Words*	*Stress*	*Low Semantic Value*	*Idea Referred to*	*Familiar*
37	yes	2	DO	no	no	yes
38	no	2	DO	no	yes	yes
39	no	3	DO	no	no	no
43	no	1	DO	no	yes	yes
48	yes	2	DO	no	yes	yes
50	yes	2	particle	no	yes	yes
51	yes	1	DO	no	no	yes
52	yes	3	DO	no	no	no
53	yes	2	DO	no	no	no
54	yes	1	particle	yes	yes	no
59	no	2	DO	no	no	no
60	yes	2	particle	no	no	yes
61	yes	1	particle	yes	yes	no
63	no	2	DO	no	no	no
65	yes	4	DO	no	yes	yes
66	yes	2	DO	no	no	yes
69	yes	1	DO	no	no	yes
70	yes	2	DO	no	yes	yes
71	yes	1	DO	no	yes	yes
76	yes	1	DO	no	no	yes
77	yes	1	DO	no	yes	no
78	yes	3	particle	no	yes	yes
79	no	2	DO	no	yes	yes
80	no	2	DO	no	no	no